



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/567,067	03/13/2006	Gerhard Rosenberger	WBA05306	9463
50488	7590	06/19/2007	EXAMINER	
ALLEMAN HALL MCCOY RUSSELL & TUTTLE LLP 806 SW BROADWAY SUITE 600 PORTLAND, OR 97205-3335			CRANE, DANIEL C	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		3725		
		MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
		06/19/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

18

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/567,067	ROSENBERGER, GERHARD	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Daniel C. Crane	3725	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 14-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 14-23 and 26-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 24 and 25 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date 2/3/2006.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

Art Unit: 3725

BASIS FOR REJECTIONS

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (a) the invention was known or used by others in this country, or patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country, before the invention thereof by the applicant for a patent.
- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- (e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371(c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

- (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

OBJECTION TO THE DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, the cross slide travel linear system movable in a selectable direction or along a selectable guide system with respect to the position of the robot that transfers the corresponding position coordinates to the robot must be shown or the feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). No new matter should be entered.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must

be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either "Replacement Sheet" or "New Sheet" pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS ON FORMAL MATTERS

Claim 30 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. The claim(s) contains subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and/or use the invention. Failure to provide details of the "cross slide travel (a) linear system in a selectable direction or along a selectable guide system with respect to the position of the robot, the corresponding position coordinates being transferred to the robot" renders the specification insufficient. In this regard the disclosure along with the drawings do not give the details of such a cross slide that also transfers its coordinates to the robot.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claims 22 and 26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The phrase "or the like" renders the claims indefinite because the claims include elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

REJECTION OF CLAIMS OVER PRIOR ART

Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Torvinen (6,474,131). See column 3, lines 58-66, and column 4, lines 55-63, where the robot 1 picks up the workpiece 100 from a previous operation and places the workpiece within the bending device and grips the workpiece by gripper 3 during the bending operation.

Claims 31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), (e) as being anticipated by Ito (6,722,178). See the first paragraph of the BACKGROUND ART (column 1) and the first paragraph of column 4, where it is evident that the sucker take-up members 34 are used for picking up a sheet 56 from a pack 58 and the gripper 32 is used to grip the sheet 56 during the bending operation. As a result the arm of the robot "grips the workpiece while feeding (sucker take-up members 34) it into the at least one bending device during bending (gripper 32)".

Claims 14-20, 23, 26-29, 32 and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito (6,722,178). While Ito does not indicate that rotation of the workpiece is performed at the bending station, it is clearly obvious to the skilled artisan having the benefit of

the Ito teaching that such would have been envisioned by Ito because the robot 10 has articulated arms that are rotatable about axes 16, 20, 25, 28 and 36. This would clearly allow the workpiece to have all four corners of the workpiece be bent by the press brake 46. As to claims 20 and 32, it is the examiner's position that the number of workpieces bent in a "batch-wise" manner would have been obvious to the skilled artisan where radius bends at the fold lines are not critical. Thus, bending two or three workpieces at a time would have been obvious to the skilled artisan so as to increase the output of the bending operation. As to claims 23 and 26, see Figure 8 for a showing of the storage bin. As to claim 27, it is clearly obvious to the skilled artisan having a level of skill within this art, that Ito performs further manufacturing operations on the workpiece subsequent to the bending procedure. Since the press brake is within a manufacturing plant, additional manufacturing is inherently performed.

Claims 21 and 22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ito (6,722,178) in view of Murakami (4,989,444). Ito shows that the bending is performed at one bending device 46. Murakami shows bending at a succession of bending devices in Figure 10 so as to perform the bending at successive stations in a line operation. It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan at the time of the invention to have modified Ito's device by providing a succession of stations using the concepts taught by Murakami so as to perform different bending at each station.

INDICATION OF ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 24 and 25 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

PRIOR ART CITED BY EXAMINER

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

RESPONSE BY APPLICANT(S)

Applicant(s) response to be fully responsive and to provide for a clear record must specifically point out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references, both those references applied in the objections and rejections and those references cited in view of the state of the art in accordance with 37 CFR 1.111 (a), (b) and (c).

PRIORITY DOCUMENTS

The priority document No. 103 36 554.0, filed August 5, 2004 in Germany, has not been received.

Art Unit: 3725

INQUIRIES

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Examiner D. Crane whose telephone number is **(571) 272-4516**. The examiner's office hours are 7:00AM-3:30PM, Monday through Friday.

Documents related to the instant application may be submitted by facsimile transmission at all times to Fax number **(571) 273-8300**. Applicant(s) is(are) reminded to clearly mark any transmission as "DRAFT" if it is not to be considered as an official response. The Examiner's Fax number is **(571) 273-4516**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

DCCrane
June 7, 2007



Daniel C. Crane
Primary Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 3725